DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 226 097 UD 022 675

AUTHOR Iwanicki, Edward F.; Gable, Robert K.
TITLE Hartford Project Concern Program. Final Evaluation Report, 1981-1982.
INSTITUTION Hartford Public Schools, Conn.
PUB DATE Sep 82
NOTE 80p.; For related documents, see ED 216 057 and ED 219 461.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Gains; *Affective Objectives; Basic Skills; *Career Development; *Cognitive Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Inner City; Metropolitan Areas; Pretests Posttests; *Program Effectiveness; *Suburban Schools
IDENTIFIERS Connecticut (Hartford); *Project Concern CT

ABSTRACT

This report presents findings of an evaluation of Project Concern, a basic skills and career development program initially undertaken to foster school desegregation by busing inner city pupils to suburban schools in the Hartford, Connecticut, metropolitan area. The report describes the outcomes of project graduates, dropouts, and nonparticipants from 1977 to 1979, focusing on two areas: (1) their sustained occupational outcomes; and (2) cognitive and affective impact of the program. Student achievement in reading, language and mathematics is described, as are findings on participants' career aspirations, educational training, work history, and transition from school to work. Data indicate that suburban and inner city Project Concern participants were positively affected by the program in terms of career development and basic skills growth, although suburban students did not show positive relative growth. The reader is cautioned, however, that findings are tentative, due to low survey returns by some schools. (WAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED226097

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

1981-1982 HARTFORD

PROJECT CONCERN PROGRAM

Conducted by

Edward F. Iwanicki
Robert K. Gable

Evaluation Consultants
University of Connecticut

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Hernan LaFontaine
Hartford Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

UD 022 675

Presented to the

Hartford Public Schools

September, 1982

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The 1981-1982 evaluation of the Hartford Project Concern Program would not have been possible without the full cooperation of the participating communities. Our sincere thanks are extended to the superintendents, principals, and teachers in the Project Concern communities for their support and assistance.

In addition, we wish to express our gratitude to particular individuals whose efforts were crucial to the conduct of the evaluation:

To Patrick Proctor of the Connecticut State Department of Education for his support and interest that a quality program evaluation be conducted.

To Robert Nearine, William Paradis, Mary Carroll, Sharon Lacey, and Gloria DeJesus of the Hartford Public Schools for their inputs into the design of the evaluation, their assistance in coordinating the testing activities, and their cooperation in providing access to information regarding Project Concern participants.

To Regina Brown and Mary Carroll for their assistance in gathering the data needed to conduct the sustained occupational outcome aspect of the evaluation.

To Donald Thompson of the University of Connecticut for his consultation regarding the career pattern aspect of the evaluation.

To suburban school personnel who assumed responsibility for administering the Metropolitan Achievement Tests to Project Concern students.

To Barbara Helms for her assistance in checking and key-punching the evaluation data.

To Marion Lapierre for her secretarial assistance, often in light of some difficult time constraints.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		i
LIST OF TABLES		iii
LIST OF APPENDICES		v
CHAPTER		
I	INTRODUCTION AND EVALUATION DESIGN	
	Introduction	1
	The 1981-1982 Project Concern Evaluation	3
II	SUSTAINED OCCUPATIONAL OUTCOMES FOR 1977-1979 PROJECT CONCERN GRADUATES, DROPOUTS AND HARTFORD NON-PARTICIPANTS	
	Introduction	5
	Research Design and Data Analysis	6
	Results	8
	Summary/Conclusions	22
III	MONITORING THE COGNITIVE AND AFFECTIVE IMPACT OF PROJECT CONCERN	
	Background and Evaluation Design	25
	Assessing the Achievement Growth of Project Concern Participants	29
	Procedures for Assessing Achievement Growth	31
	Findings Regarding the Cognitive Impact of Project Concern	35
	Monitoring Affective Impact	42
IV	SUMMARY	
	Sustained Occupational Outcomes for 1977-1978 Project Concern Graduates, Dropouts and Hartford Non-Participants	49
	An Examination of the Cognitive and Affective Impact of Project Concern	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	1979-80 and 1981-82 Survey Return Rates for Graduates, Dropouts and Non-Participants	9
2	Stability of Career Aspirations by Group: Percentage of 1979-80 and 1981-82 Students Aspiring to Upper Six Career Levels	13
3	Stability of Career Planning and Pattern: Percentage of 1979-80 and 1980-81 Students Exhibiting Consistency	15
4	Percentages of Respondents with Consistent, Inconsistent and Mixed Career Patterns for 1979-80 and 1981-82 Data by Group	17
5	Response Percentages for Selected Items on the Follow-up of Graduates Survey	19
6	Summary by Grade Level of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test, Spring 1981 (Pre-) and Spring 1982 (Post) Results for Project Concern Students	32
7	Summary by Grade Level of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test, Spring 1981 (Pre-) and Spring 1982 (Post) Results for Project Concern Students	33
8	Summary of Mean Normal Curve Equivalent Achievement Growth by Grade Level, Skill Area, and Program Component for Project Concern Participants	37
9	Summary by Grade Level and Percentile Category of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test Spring 1981 (Pre-) and Spring 1982 (Post) NCE Results for Project Concern Students-Suburban Component	39
10	Summary by Grade Level and Percentile Category of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test Spring 1981 (Pre-) and Spring 1982 (Post) NCE Results for Project Concern Students-Inner-City Component	40
11	Percent and Frequency of "True" Responses on the Student Survey for Students Participating in All Components of the Project Concern Program	44
12	Percent and Frequency of "True" Responses on the Student Survey by Grade Level for Students Participating in the Suburban Schools Component of the Project Concern Program	45

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
13	Percent and Frequency of "True" Responses on the Student Survey by Grade Level for Students Participating in the Inner-City Schools Component of the Project Concern Program.....	46

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
A	1982 Follow-up of Graduates Survey Form.....	56
B	Examples of Various Occupations from the North-Hatte Occupational Prestige Scale and Their Relative Ranking from 1 to 10.....	58
C	Examples of the Three Types of Career Patterns.....	60

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND EVALUATION DESIGN

Introduction

The Hartford Project Concern Program began in September of 1966 as an experiment in educational intervention for children from Title I schools concentrated in the north end of Hartford.[1] Receiving support from many areas (State of Connecticut Department of Education, The Hartford Board of Education, The Hartford Court of Common Council, The Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce, The Urban League, Community Renewal Team, The NCAAP, The Alliance of Ministers, The PTA, The Archdiocese of Hartford, parents, Boards of Education from the five original participating communities, administrators, teachers, members of the legislature, and religious leaders other than the Alliance of Ministers or the Archdiocese of Hartford), the project developed seven objectives in the original application to the Federal Government for funds under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

These objectives were as follows:

1. To develop a structure between a city and its suburbs that will desegregate schools.
2. To discover the attitudes of children, parents, educators, and the community when city children are bussed to the suburbs.
3. To learn what happens to the educational achievement of both city and suburban children when city children go to suburban schools.

---

[1] Information relating to the history and current enrollment status of Project Concern was obtained from project materials.

4. To find out what social activities city children can participate in when they go to school in the suburbs.

5. To encourage Connecticut towns to think about desegregation of schools in regional terms.

6. To train school administrators, teachers, and aides for integrated schools.

7. To find out what communities can do to make bussing effective.

From 1966 to 1979, participation of suburban communities increased from five communities (265 children attending 35 schools) to thirteen communities with 1,058 students attending 75 schools. In addition, during the 1979-80 school year 81 students attended six non-public schools in four communities and 289 students attended five inner-city schools in the south end of Hartford. Beginning with the 1980-81 school year, the Project Concern program was reduced. The non-public school component was eliminated and additional students were not allowed to enter the suburban school aspect of the program.

Over the years there have been several inquiries regarding the effectiveness of Project Concern. More specifically, school boards, educators, and citizens in participating communities have been asking whether Project Concern is successful from an educational standpoint. The difficulty in answering this question lies in defining the term "successful". Some accept the ability of students of differing races to interact effectively as evidence of the success of Project Concern. Others seek measures of cognitive and affective test growth as evidence of program success.

Two in-depth inquiries into the impact of Project Concern for the

suburban, non-public and inner-city components were initiated during the 1975-1976 and 1976-1977 school years when the Capitol Region Education Council received grants from the Connecticut State Department of Education to evaluate the program. Further information regarding the rationale and results of these two evaluations can be found in the documents entitled 1975-1976 Hartford Project Concern Evaluation Report (Iwanicki, 1976) and An Evaluation of the 1976-1977 Hartford Project Concern Program (iwanicki and Gable, 1977). Further, during the 1977-1978 and 1978-1979 project years an evaluation of the cognitive and affective growth of students in the suburban component was conducted (see An Evaluation of the 1977-1978 Hartford Project Concern Program, Iwanicki and Gable, 1978, and Final Evaluation Report 1978-1979 Hartford Project Concern Program, Iwanicki and Gable, 1979). More extensive evaluations of Project Concern were conducted during the 1979-1980 and 1980-1981 school years (see Final Evaluation Report 1979-1980 Hartford Project Concern Program, Iwanicki and Gable, 1980 and Final Evaluation Report 1980-1981 Hartford Project Concern Program, Iwanicki and Gable, 1981). Individuals interested in a summary of the findings of the more current evaluations may wish to consult The Hartford Project Concern Program: A Synthesis of the Evaluation Findings from 1976-1980 (Iwanicki and Gable, 1981).

The 1981-1982 Project Concern Evaluation

The evaluation of the 1981-82 Project Concern program focused on the following two areas:

- An evaluation of the sustained occupational outcomes of Project Concern graduates, dropouts and Hartford non-participants.

.An examination of the cognitive and affective impact of Project Concern.

Subsequent chapters of this report provide detailed information regarding .the evaluation design, procedures, and findings for these two areas.

CHAPTER II

SUSTAINED OCCUPATIONAL OUTCOMES FOR 1977-1979 PROJECT CONCERN GRADUATES, DROPTOUTS AND HARTFORD NON-PARTICIPANTS

Introduction

The 1979-80 Project Concern evaluation included an analysis of the career patterns of three groups of 1977-1979 graduates:

1. Graduates: Project Concern students who graduated from suburban schools.

2. Dropouts: Project Concern students who returned to Hartford and graduated from Hartford Schools.

3. Non-Participants: Hartford students who were similar to Project Concern students in many respects, but did not participate in Project Concern and graduated from Hartford schools.

Data were obtained for a total of 71 students pertaining to the areas of career aspiration, consistency of career planning and pattern, work history, and educational training.

As stated in the 1979-80 Final Report (p. 23), the evaluation findings provided strong support for the contention that Project Concern had a positive effect on the career development and maturity of the students who participated in the program. Project Concern graduates exhibited significantly higher levels of aspiration and significantly more consistent career planning and progression than non-participants. While not statistically significant, graduates also were more likely to seek post-secondary education or vocational training when compared to non-participants. Although not as consistent as program graduates, those students who dropped out of Project Concern prior to graduation tended to show a number of positive benefits as well. Measured against those who did not participate in Project Concern, graduates and drop-

outs alike appeared to have received significant career development benefits.

These 1979-80 findings were quite supportive of Project Concern. It appears essential, though, to examine these career related areas over time to see if the positive effects and trends favoring the Project Concern graduates have been sustained over time. This chapter will present the findings of such a sustained occupational study. First, we will review the description of the three groups studied during the 1980 (1979-80) and 1982 (1981-82) evaluations. Following this, we will describe the survey instrument used, the data gathering and data analysis procedures employed, as well as the survey return rates and, finally, the results of the study.

Research Design and Data Analysis

The 1982 sustained occupational outcomes evaluation studied the same three groups of students identified in the 1980 report.

Groups Studied. The 1977, 1978 and 1979 Project Concern graduates totaled 105 students. Fifteen students from each year were randomly selected for the 1980 follow-up study, yielding a sample of 45 students. The second group, Project Concern dropouts, consisted of 15 students who met the following criteria:

1. Participated at least 2 years in Project Concern.
2. Dropped out of the project in either 6, 7 or 8th grade.
3. Returned to and graduated from the Hartford school system.

Initially, 47 students were identified from the potential 1977-1979 graduating classes who left the Project. Of these, 47, only 15 met all of the criteria listed above.

The third group, Hartford non-participants, consisted of 10 students

randomly selected from each of the 1977-1979 Hartford graduating classes. This sample of 30 students met the following criteria:

1. Attended Hartford elementary and secondary schools.
2. Attended Title I eligible schools.
3. Were eligible to be selected for Project Concern (i.e., not in special education).

Ideally, these students were also going to be screened to eliminate any students who were selected, but chose not to participate in Project Concern. This final screening was not possible since records of those invited to participate were not available. This does not appear to be a problem, though, as the probability of such a student being in the sample is quite low.

Instrumentation. The survey form employed in the 1980 evaluation was revised to eliminate outdated questions (item 1, "When you were in high school, what type of job or career did you want to have after high school"; item 6, "How long were you out of high school before you got your first full-time job?") and to add some new questions reflecting the areas of the transition from school to work (item 6) and perceptions regarding knowledge of jobs (item 8) and career satisfaction (item 9). Interested readers may find a copy of the 1982 survey form in Appendix A.

Data Gathering. Project Concern staff conducted the follow-up of the Project Concern graduate group. Forms were mailed to each of the selected students; follow-up phone calls and mailings were conducted to enhance the return rate. Forms for the dropout and non-participant groups were sent out by a consultant to the evaluators, Regina Brown. Prior to the initial mailing each student's cumulative file last known address was verified by phone. After the initial mailing, follow-up procedures consisted of phone calls, a second

mailing, and in a few cases, a home visit.

Data Analysis. Data analysis consisted of developing frequencies and percentages for each area on the questionnaire. Responses to some items were coded for level of career aspiration and consistency prior to calculating the percentages. Chi-square comparisons for dependent and independent proportions were then made within and among the three target groups. Responses to open-ended questions were recorded on typescripts for interpretation.

Results

Survey Return Rates. The validity of the results of a follow-up survey of high school graduates is dependent upon both the return rate and the quality (i.e., lack of vague answers) of information received. Table 1 contains the return rates for the 1980 study which were 87%, 87% and 63% for the graduate, dropout and non-participant groups. The 1982 study targeted only those students who had responded to the 1980 survey. The lower section of Table 1 lists the 1982 return rates for the three groups as follows: graduates, 74%; dropouts, 69%; and non-participants, 42%. It should be noted that these returns reflect 67%, 60% and 27% of the original students targeted in the 1980 study (see bottom row of Table 1). These return rates, especially for the non-participants, are found in such follow-up studies but do raise some significant cautions for making firm conclusions based solely upon these data. As such, the findings to be presented should be considered tentative and possibly biased due to a lack of higher survey returns.

Given the lack of a sufficient return rate and the associated potential for sampling error involved in the resulting percentages, especially for the non-participants, it was necessary to determine if the 1982 respondents from

Table 1

1979-80 and 1981-82 Survey Return Rates
for Graduates, Dropouts and Non-Participants

Year of Graduation	Project Concern Graduates 1979-80 Sent	Returned	1981-82 Sent	Returned	Project Concern Dropouts 1979-80 Sent	Returned	1981-82 Sent	Returned	Hartford Non-Participants 1979-80 Sent	Returned	1981-82 Sent	Returned
1977	15	13	13	7	4	3	3	2	10	7	7	3
1978	15	13	13	11	4	4	4	2	10	4	4	1
1979	15	13	13	11	7	6	6	5	10	8	8	4
TOTAL	45	39	39	29	15	13	13	9	30	19	19	8
Return Rate 1979-80	87%				87%				63%			
Return Rate 1981-82			74%				69%				42%	
Percentage of 1979-80 Sample			67%				60%				27%	

each group "represented" the respondents from the 1980 survey. That is, are the 29 1982 graduate respondents (see Table 1) similar to the 39 1980 respondents? This question is important since only 29 of the original 39 respondents returned the survey. To the extent that the 1982 group is different from the 1980 group, the results of the follow-up have limited validity. To answer this preliminary question, the 29 graduates responding to the 1982 survey were considered to be a sample of the original 39 respondents in the 1980 survey. The 1980 survey responses in the areas of career aspiration and career consistency for the 29 respondents were compared with the 1980 survey responses of the total 39 students. That is, 95% confidence intervals were put around the "sample" percentage for the 29 students to determine if it was reasonable to assume that the interval encompassed the "population" mean for the total 39 students. For all three groups it was concluded that the 1982 survey respondents could be considered representative of the 1980 survey respondents in these two primary areas. We should note, though, that the small sample sizes involved resulted in relatively large confidence intervals around the sample means. Thus, while we conclude that the 1982 respondents represent the 1980 respondents, this conclusion should be considered tentative, especially for the non-participant group. This situation will place limitations on making confident comparisons of either the graduates or dropouts with the non-participant group. With these limitations in mind, we now return to our examination of career aspirations with respect to their stability within groups and differences among groups.

Demographic Variables. Three demographic variables were included in the survey: marital status, number of children and sex. Incomplete information prevented analysis of marital status and number of children. With respect to

sex of respondents, the percentages of males in the 1980 and 1982 surveys are presented below. The 1982 survey included a large percentage of female respondents from the dropout group than the 1980 survey.

Group	Percent Male 1980	1982
Graduates	56%	60%
Dropouts	39%	11%
Non-Participants	42%	38%

Career Aspiration. The 1980 survey examined the area of career aspiration through two questions. Students were asked, "When you were in high school, what type of job or career did you want after high school?" and "What type of job or career would you like to have five years from now?" The response to each item was coded using the North-Hatte Occupational Prestige Rating Scale. This rating is based on a national opinion survey of the relative prestige of various occupations. Generally, higher levels of prestige are ascribed to the occupations which require high levels of education or training and provide a greater financial return. The validity of this rating system has been demonstrated in a number of research studies from 1949 to the present. The occupational prestige rating groups are divided into ten categories. For the purposes of this study, each career/occupational choice stated by the respondent was assigned a numerical value from one (high) to ten (low) based on its location on the scale. Specific occupations and their relative rankings are shown in Appendix B to further illustrate the ranking system.

The 1980 survey data analyses indicated that occupational choices made in high school were at a significantly higher occupational level for graduates than for non-participants. No differences were found among the groups for the

five-year projected occupational choice.

The 1982 study did not repeat the high school choice item since it would have been redundant. It was appropriate, though, to ask again about their job or career choice five years from now. Career aspiration was thus examined in two ways based upon the 1982 responses to item 4: What type of job or or career would you like to have five years from now? The first analysis examined the stability of each group's career aspiration from 1980 to 1982. The second analysis examined the differences among the three groups with respect to the 1982 levels of career aspiration.

The stability of career aspirations was examined by comparing the percentage of 1980 and 1982 students in each group who "aspired to careers or jobs five years from now" (item 4) which were judged to be in the top six ranks on the North-Hatte Occupational Prestige Scale. Table 2 contains the percentages for each group. To examine if there was a lack of stability in career aspirations we inspect the percentages in the diagonal of each matrix as these percentages represent changes in aspiration levels. For example, 24% of the 1980 graduate group were associated with shifts out of the upper six career levels and 14% were associated with shifts into the upper six career aspirations levels. The chi-square (X^2) values for dependent proportions reported below each matrix indicate that there were no statistically significant patterns in changes in career aspirations for any of the three groups. Thus, while some changes were present, the career aspirations were found overall to be stable for each group.

Differences in career aspirations among the groups for the 1982 responses were also examined. The percentage of students aspiring to the upper six career levels were as follows: graduates, 59%; dropouts, 56%; and non-

Table 2

Stability of Career Aspirations by Group:
Percentage of 1979-80 and 1981-82 Students Aspiring
to Upper Six Career Levels[a]

Graduates 1979-80

1981-82 \ 1979-80	Yes	No
No	24% (7)	17% (5)
Yes	45% (13)	14% (4)

x^2 = .82, ns

Dropouts 1979 - 80

1981-82 \ 1979-80	Yes	No
No	33% (3)	11% (1)
Yes	56% (5)	0% (0)

x^2 = 3.0, ns

Non-Participants 1979-80

1981-82 \ 1979-80	Yes	No
No	26% (2)	37% (3)
Yes	37% (3)	0% (0)

x^2 = 2.0, ns

[a] Numbers in the corner of each cell represent frequencies.

participants, 63%. Chi-square tests for independent proportions indicated that no significant differences were present across the three groups. This finding is consistent with that reported for this same item in the 1979-80 report.

Consistency of Career Planning and Pattern. The consistency of career planning and career progression or pattern was documented by examining three pieces of data. The first was the answer to the "five year from now" career aspiration question (item 4) discussed earlier. The second was the work history information presented in responses to item 2, and the third represented post-high school training/educational activities listed in item 10. Analogous to the 1980 study, the career pattern for each respondent was categorized into one of three groups: consistent, inconsistent, or mixed. A consistent career pattern was one in which the occupational choice (particularly the five years in the future choice) was reinforced by a work history and/or post-secondary education activity which would likely lead to the attainment of the occupational choice. A typical pattern for each of the three categories is presented in Appendix C to assist the reader in understanding how these determinations were made.

The stability of the career consistency data was thus examined to ascertain if there were any shifts in consistency and inconsistency within each separate group. Table 3 presents the percentage of students who maintained consistent career patterns from the 1980 survey to the 1982 survey. The chi-square values for dependent proportions presented below each matrix

Table 3

Stability of Career Planning and Pattern:
Percentage of 1979-80 and 1980-81 Students
Exhibiting Consistency[a]

Graduates 1979-80

1981-82	Yes	No
No	27% (7)	15% (4)
Yes	50% (13)	2% (2)

$x^2 = 2.8$, ns[1]

Dropouts 1979 - 80

1981-82	Yes	No
No	22% (2)	11% (1)
Yes	67% (6)	0% (0)

$x^2 = 2.0$, ns

Non-Participants 1979-80

1981-82	Yes	No
No	12% (1)	38% (3)
Yes	38% (3)	12% (1)

$x^2 = 0.0$, ns

[1] Graduate group had 3 cases of missing data for 1981-82 survey.

[a] Numbers in the corner of each cell represent frequencies.

indicate that while some shifts were found, all three groups maintained relative stability with respect to the consistency of career patterns and no statistically significant chi-square were found.

Differences in the consistency of career planning and patterns among the groups was also examined. Readers will recall that for the total set of 1980 survey respondents, graduates (67%) and dropouts (80%) were found to exhibit higher levels of consistency in their career planning and patterns than non-participants (37%). The data from the 1979-80 report is presented in section 1 of Table 4. Section 2 presents the corresponding percentages for the 1980 survey data for those students who also responded to the 1982 survey. As noted earlier, the percentages in columns 1 and 2 were not statistically different. Section 3 contains the percentages of students in the 1982 survey who exhibited consistent career planning and patterns. While the dropout group appears to have a higher consistency percentage (67%) than either the graduates (58%) or non-particpants (57%), no statistically significant differences were found using the chi-square for independent proportions procedure.

This finding appears at first to be confusing in light of the data presented earlier. That is, we noted that the 1980 survey indicated that the graduates and dropouts were more consistent than non-participants, and that all three groups exhibited stable career patterns from the 1980 survey to the 1982 survey. But now we report that the 1982 survey data show no significant differences among the groups. Unfortunately, this situation could be due to the lack of comprehensive information supplied by the respondents in the 1982 study and the low return rates. Based upon our prior discussion of the problem of non-responses from the non-participant group,

Table 4

Percentages of Respondents with Consistent, Inconsistent and Mixed Career Patterns for 1979-80 and 1981-82 Data by Group

Group	Career Pattern	1979-80 Data: 1 Total Group N	1979-80 Data: 1 Total Group %	1979-80 Data: 2 Respondents to 1981-82 Survey N	1979-80 Data: 2 Respondents to 1981-82 Survey %	1981-82 Data: 3 N	1981-82 Data: 3 %
Graduates	Consistent	26	67	21	73	15[a]	58
	Inconsistent	7	18	3	10	5	19
	Mixed	6	15	5	17	6	23
Dropouts	Consistent	10	80	8	89	6	67
	Inconsistent	3	20	1	11	3	33
	Mixed	0					
Non-Participants	Consistent	7	37	3	43	4	57
	Inconsistent	9	47	4	57	3	43
	Mixed	3	16				

[a] Although 29 graduates returned the surveys, incomplete answers resulted in 3 surveys not being coded for this analysis.

we cannot place a lot of confidence in any comparisons with the non-participants. As a result, the finding of no difference among the groups may have limited validity and should not receive great attention.

Educational Training. Training and educational preparation are important aspects of career development. Consistent with the 1980 survey, it was found that, although not statistically significant, a higher percentage of graduates (46%) were taking training for or employed in the career they wanted to follow at the time they left high school (item 1) than were non-participants (25%). Further, a significantly higher (x^2= 4.74, df=1, $p<.05$) percentage of graduates (86%) indicated that they had attended any schools or colleges since graduating from high school (item 10) than did non-participants (50%). Note that the 1980 survey found that a significantly higher percentage of graduates (72%) had attended schools and colleges than dropouts (39%). This percentage of graduates was not significantly higher than the percentage of non-participants (53%).

Work History. Another significant factor in career development is the actual work history of the individual. Individuals were asked to indicate their work history which included whether they had held a job, the number and types of jobs held, whether the job was full or part-time, and whether they liked the job. Consistent with the 1980 survey, no statistically significant differences were found among the three groups. Reference to items 2, 2a, 2b and 3 in Table 5 indicates that 90% of the graduates and all of the dropouts and non-participants indicated that they have held jobs. Those graduates not having any jobs were attending school. Further, while not statistically significant, slightly more of the dropouts (88%) and non-participants (88%) reported (item 2a) having held 1-2 jobs than graduates

Table 5

Response Percentages for Selected Items on the Follow-up of Graduates Survey

	Survey Item	Response Option	Group: Graduates N=29	Dropouts N=9	Non-Partic. N=8
1	Are you now taking training for or employed in the career you wanted to follow at the time you left high school?	Yes	64	a	25
2	Since leaving high school, have you held any jobs?	Yes	90	100	100
2a	Number of jobs listed?	1-2	82	88	88
		3-4	18	12	12
2b	Number of full-time jobs?	0	11	14	13
		1	67	58	62
		2	11	14	25
		3	11		
		4		14	
3	How do you like your present job?	Very much	57	89	74
		Fairly well	28	11	13
		Do not like it	5		
		Never had a full-time job	10		
5	What effect did your high school education have on the jobs you have held since graduating from high school?	No effect	30	44	75
		Helped get the job	60[c]	56	25[c]
		Never had a full-time job	10		

Table 5 (Cont.)

	Survey Item	Response Option	Group: Graduates N=29	Group: Dropouts N=9	Group: Non-Partic. N=8
6[b]	How hard was it for you to make the change from being a student to a full-time worker?	Very easy	33	33	38
		Easy	44	56	38
		Not very easy	17	11	12
		Have not had a full-time job	6		12
7	What has been the main difficulty you have experienced in your present job?	None	65	100	74
		Conflicts with supervisors	5		13
		Schooling did not prepare me for the job			
		Never had a full-time job	10		
		Other	20		13
8b	In comparison to other people your age, how much do you feel you know about lots of different jobs?	More	50	56	71
		Same	50	44	29
		Less			
9b	Comparing yourself to other former Hartford students who graduated about the same time you did, how do you feel you have done with respect to your working life?	Generally better	50	78	50
		Same	50	22	50
		Not as well			
10	Have you attended any schools or colleges since graduating from high school?	Yes	86[c]	56	50[c]

a Data missing due to lack of student responses to item.

b New items on the 1981-82 survey.

c Percentages underlined are significantly different at the .05 level.

(82%) and slightly less of the dropouts (58%) and non-participants (62%) than graduates (67%) reported having held one full-time job (item 2b). Under the severe limitations that these differences are not statistically significant, we do observe a "slight trend" for the graduates responding to the survey to have held fewer jobs, more of which are full-time jobs. Finally, contrary to the 1980 survey, a lower percentage of graduates (57%) indicated that they liked their present job (item 3) "very much" than did dropouts (89%) or non-participants (74%). While not a significant difference, this trend could suggest a potential job mobility situation for graduates who we found earlier (item 10) to have a significantly higher rate of attending schools or colleges. It could be that the present jobs held by the graduates are a "means to an end." Given this situation it is not uncommon to find lower levels of current job satisfaction.

Transition from School to Work. Five items (5-9) listed in Table 5 examined perceptions of the high school experience and the transition to the work environment. A significantly ($x^2 = 3.87$, $df=1$, $p<.05$) higher percentage of graduates (60%) felt that their high school education helped them to get the job they wanted (item 5) than did non-participants (25%). This is an interesting shift from the 1979-80 survey where 62% of the non-participants and 49% of the graduates felt this was the case. While the 1979-80 difference was not statistically significant, the change in opinions during the two-year period (1979-80 to 1981-82) appears to be a positive statement for the program.

While all three groups found the transition from school to work to be relatively easy (new item 6), the percentage of respondents indicating that they experienced no difficulties with their present jobs was lower (65%)

(not statistically significant) for graduates than for non-participants (74%) or dropouts (100%). Most of the graduates indicating they had difficulties listed low pay or boring work as the problem, suggesting again the possibility of a desire for upward job mobility or the perception that the current job was a "means to a larger end."

Two new items (8, 9) focused on perceptions of knowledge regarding various jobs and satisfaction with the career. While non-participants indicated that in comparison to their peers they felt they knew more about many jobs (71%) than did graduates (50%), the difference was not statistically significant and most likely reflects their tendency to hold slightly more jobs (item 2a), especially part-time (item 2b), than did graduates as we reported earlier. Finally, students were asked to compare themselves with their peers and reflect on how they have done with respect to their working life. Half of the graduates (50%) and non-participants (50%) and 78% of the dropouts indicated "generally better." These differences were not significantly different.

Summary/Conclusions

This chapter has presented an analysis of the sustained occupational outcomes for 1977-79 Project Concern graduates, dropouts and non-participants. The areas included were career aspiration, consistency of career planning and patterns, educational training, work history, and the transition from school to work. Participants included the respondents to the original 1979-80 survey. Due to the low survey return rates, especially the non-participants, and the lack of quality/comprehensive information included in some returned surveys, the validity of the findings in this chapter may

be limited or biased. Readers are therefore cautioned to consider the findings as tentative and not to make any firm conclusions based solely upon these data.

Based upon the results of the 1982 survey, and in some cases the comparisons with the 1980 survey, the following conclusions are presented:

Career aspirations of the graduates, dropouts and non-participants were found to be stable from 1980 to 1982.

Consistent with the 1980 survey, there were no significant differences in the five-year projected career aspirations among the graduates, dropouts and non-participants.

The extent of consistency in career planning and patterns was found to be stable for graduates, dropouts and non-participants from 1980 to 1982.

There were no significant differences among the graduates, dropouts and non-participants with respect to the consistency in career planning and progression. While the 1980 survey found graduates and dropouts to have more consistent career patterns than non-participants, the limitations associated with the low return rate for non-participants made the comparisons among the 1982 respondents difficult.

Consistent with the 1980 survey, there was a trend (not significant) for more graduates (64%) to be taking training for or employed in the career they wanted to follow at the time they left high school than for non-participants (25%).

A significantly higher percentage (86%) of graduates have attended schools or colleges than did non-participants (50%). The 1980 survey found graduates (72%) to have a significantly higher percentage than dropouts (39%) but not significantly higher than non-participants (53%).

A trend (not significant) was found in the 1982 survey data for program graduates to have held fewer jobs, more of which are full-time jobs.

A trend (not significant) was found for less graduates to like their present job "very much" than do dropouts (89%) or non-participants (74%). It was hypothesized that this finding, along with the increased rate for graduates attending school or college, could suggest the graduates perception of the current job as a "means to an end" and signify the potential for job mobility. On

the 1980 survey the graduates and dropouts tended to like their present job more than did non-participants.

A significantly higher percentage of graduates (60%) felt that their high school education helped them get the job they wanted than did non-participants (25%). The 1980 survey found a non-significant difference where 49% of the graduates and 62% of the non-participants felt this was the case.

The 1980 survey data clearly provided strong support for the contention that Project Concern had a positive effect on the career development of participants. The 1982 survey results were plagued by low return rates and in some cases a lack of comprehensive information provided by respondents. This situation clearly limited the validity of comparisons of program graduates especially with the non-participants. While these particular comparisons were at times limited, positive support for the program was found in several areas examined in the 1982 survey.

CHAPTER III

MONITORING THE COGNITIVE AND AFFECTIVE IMPACT OF PROJECT CONCERN

Background and Evaluation Design

For at least the last five years the funding proposal for the Project Concern Program has contained the following performance objectives:

1. Pupils will show month for month gains on an average by grade in Language Development.
2. Pupils will show month for month gains on an average by grade in Math.
3. Pupils will show a positive self-concept and attitude toward the school at the end of a year's participation.

Up through the 1978-1979 school year, evaluations of the cognitive outcomes stated in the program objectives utilized individually administered achievement tests (i.e., the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests and the KeyMath Diagnostic Arithmetic Test). These tests were administered to a random sample of students at grades 1-8 on a pre- to post test basis. Then, the results were anlayzed and reported as they relate to the program objectives.

Some disadvantages to this approach were evident. First, there were some problems in implementing a pre- to post test design on a yearly basis. By the time new participants were selected, transfers were made, project files were updated, and the logistics of sampling as well as pretesting were worked out, students were not pretested until late November or early December. Given that post testing must be conducted

in May, there were only about five to six months between the times of pre- and post testing. This is a relatively short period of time for examining pre- post test growth.

Secondly, although the results provided evidence of student growth, such growth could not be compared to the growth of comparable students in Hartford since the same tests were not used with the general population of students in the Hartford Public Schools. Also, some Project Concern students were becoming exceedinly test wise on the Woodcock and KeyMath. Alternate forms of these tests were used on a pre- to post test basis for five years. Since the same level was used at grades 1-8, students at the upper grade levels were very familiar with the content of the test exercises. A final disadvantage of the approach used in past evaluations was that some members of the education community and the public questioned the credibility of results based on a random sample.

To alleviate these problems, it was decided that the 1979-1980 and subsequent evaluations of Project Concern would monitor the cognitive performance of all Project Concern students at grades 2-8 on a year-to-year basis using the same group administered achievement tests that are being used in the Hartford Public Schools. Appropriate levels and forms of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests in reading, language, and mathematics would be administered to all project participants in the spring according to the testing schedule used in the Hartford Public Schools. Results from these instruments would be analyzed on a pre- to post test basis (i.e., spring of one year to spring of the next year) and reported as they relate to the objectives of Project Concern.

Along with the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Project Concern

students would also be administered a brief ten-item Student Survey. This Student Survey, developed for use in past evaluations of Project Concern, would be used to monitor Project Concern participants' attitude toward school and self-concept on a continuing basis.

Consistent with this policy for monitoring the cognitive performances of Project Concern students, all participants at grades 2-10 were administered the appropriate level and form of the 1978 version of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests in the spring of 1982. At the same time, students at grades 2-8 were administered the Student Survey. The Metropolitan Achievement Tests were administered to all students participating in the Suburban Public and Inner-City school components of the program. Participating suburban school districts accepted responsibility for testing all Project Concern students in their community using the test materials provided by the Hartford Public Schools. Metropolitan Achievement Tests were administered in the suburbs at grades 9 and 10 in addition to grades 2-8 due to a new Hartford Board of Education policy to extend its testing program to the higher grade levels.

It is important to note that during the 1979-1980 school year, the Metropolitan Achievement Tests were administered to suburban participants by Hartford Test Specialists. This approach was not used during the 1980-1981 or 1981-1982 school years due to the problems encountered by Hartford Test Specialists. Given the time needed to administer the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, it was difficult to administer these tests to students in suburban schools without disrupting their educational program somewhat. In some cases students at the upper grade levels resented being taken away from their normal school activities to

be tested, especially by "strangers." Students participating in the Inner-City component of the program were administered the Metropolitan Achievement Tests by their classroom teacher as part of the Hartford Public Schools spring testing program. Project Concern participants were tested according to the following schedule:

Grades 5-8: March 1-17

Grades 9-10: April 5-16

Grades 2-4: May 3-19

Students were tested in the areas of reading, language and mathematics using the forms and levels of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests noted below.

Grade	MATs Level	Form
2	Primary 2	JS
3-4	Elementary	JS
5-6	Intermediate	JS
7-9	Advanced 1	JS
10	Advanced 2	JS

At grades 2-4 students were tested using machine scorable booklets, while at grades 5-10 separate machine scorable answer sheets were used. All tests were scored and results reported using the computer facilities of the Hartford Public Schools. Some points need to be clarified concerning the testing activities as they relate to the evaluation of the cognitive impact of Project Concern. First, only Project Concern Suburban participants were tested at grades 9 and 10. The Inner-City component of the Concern programs does not operate beyond grade 8. Secondly, although grade 10 students were tested, these results could

not be analyzed and discussed since these students were not tested last year at grade 9. Thus, subsequent analysis of Metropolitan Achievement Tests growth will focus on grades 3-9 for students in the Suburban component of Project Concern and on grades 3-8 for students in the Inner-City program. The number of Project Concern students for whom spring 1982 results were provided is summarized below by grade level and program component.

Grade	Suburban	Inner-City
2	50	25
3	52	23
4	72	17
5	75	39
6	82	33
7	100	34
8	107	29
9	90	

It is important to note that some difficulty was encountered in tesing Suburban Project Concern students. Personnel in participating suburban school settings were less than positively motivated to conduct the required testing activities given that the Hartford Board of Education had already announced that the Suburban Project Concern Program would not be continued during the next school year.

Assessing the Achievement Growth of Project Concern Participants

As noted in the prior section, the basic approach being utilized to assess the achievement growth of Project Concern participants is to

compare the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) results from the spring of one year to those for the spring of the next school year. Thus, in this year's evaluation of Project Concern, the MAT results obtained for spring 1981 and spring 1982 were compared. In using this approach, spring to spring MAT results must be collated by student. Some students who were tested in the spring of 1982 were not tested in the spring of 1981, either because they were absent or because they were not enrolled in Project Concern at that time. The number and percent of students tested in the spring of 1982 for whom spring 1981 MAT results were available is summarized below by grade level and program component.

Grade	Suburban		Inner-City	
	N	%	N	%
3	48	92	21	91
4	68	94	13	76
5	69	92	34	87
6	79	96	29	88
7	84	84	30	88
8	101	94	24	83
9	79	88		

In comparing spring 1981 and spring 1982 test results, it is important to note that different test schedules were used during these two administrations of the MATs. In examining the MAT achievement growth, the testing times and growth periods noted below should be kept in mind.

Grade	Spring 1981 MAT Testing Time	Spring 1982 MAT Testing Time	Growth Period
3	2.7	3.8	11 months
4	3.7	4.8	11 months
5	4.6	5.6	10 months
6	5.6	6.6	10 months
7	6.6	7.6	10 months
8	7.8	8.6	8 months
9	8.8	9.7	9 months

Procedures for Assessing Achievement Growth

To assess the amount of achievement growth exhibited by Project Concern participants, mean standard scores were calculated by grade level in the areas of reading, language, and mathematics for the spring of 1981 and spring 1982 results. Using appropriate spring norm tables for the 1978 edition of the MATs, spring 1981 and spring 1982 scaled score means were then converted into mean percentile ranks and mean normal curve equivalent scores. The difference between the spring 1981 and spring 1982 mean normal curve equivalent scores in the basic skill areas was used as a measure of mean growth. The results of these analyses are summarized by grade level and program component in Tables 6-7.

In reviewing these tables, it is important to note that scaled scores provide a measure of student achievement in equal interval units. These scaled scores can be compared across forms and levels of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests within a particular skill area. For example, in the area of Reading for the spring 1982 testing, it is

Table 6

Summary by Grade Level of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test
Spring 1981 (Pre-) and Spring 1982 (Post) Results
for Project Concern Students

Suburban Component

Grade	N	[1]Type of Score	Reading			Language			Mathematics		
			Pre-	Post	Growth	Pre-	Post	Growth	Pre-	Post	Growth
3	48	SS	619	651	32**	510	587	77**	504	568	64**
		%ile	50	46	-4	52	52	0	50	52	2
		NCE	50.0	47.9	-2.1	51.1	51.1	0	50.0	51.1	1.1
4	68	SS	648	679	31**	588	641	53**	558	608	50**
		%ile	44	42	-2	54	52	-2	46	44	-2
		NCE	46.8	45.8	-1.0	52.1	51.1	-1.0	47.9	46.8	-1.1
5	69	SS	683	711	29**	645	673	28**	609	664	55**
		%ile	44	46	2	54	48	-6	44	50	6
		NCE	46.8	47.9	1.1	52.1	48.9	-3.2	46.8	50.0	3.2
6	79	SS	703	739	36**	681	718	37**	663	706	43**
		%ile	42	52	10	50	54	4	50	54	4
		NCE	45.8	51.1	5.3	50.0	52.1	2.1	50.0	52.1	2.1
7	84	SS	727	728	1	705	731	26**	686	720	34**
		%ile	46	38	-8	54	48	-6	46	42	-4
		NCE	47.9	43.6	-4.3	52.1	48.9	-3.2	47.9	45.8	-2.1
8	101	SS	735	766	31**	746	765	19**	718	756	38**
		%ile	42	46	4	54	50	-4	40	48	8
		NCE	45.8	47.9	2.1	52.1	50.0	-2.1	44.7	48.9	4.2
9	79	SS	772	796	24**	770	798	28**	756	770	14**
		%ile	48	52	6	52	56	4	48	46	-2
		NCE	48.9	51.1	2.2	51.1	53.2	2.1	48.9	47.9	-1.0

[1]Note: SS=Scaled Score; %ile-Percentile Rank; NCE=Normal Curve Equivalent

**p < .01

Table 7

Summary by Grade Level of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test
Spring 1981 (Pre-) and Spring 1982 (Post) Results
for Project Concern Students

Inner-City Component

Grade	N	[1]Type of Score	Reading			Language			Mathematics		
			Pre-	Post	Growth	Pre-	Post	Growth	Pre-	Post	Growth
3	21	SS	598	647	49**	490	600	110**	521	599	78**
		%ile	40	44	4	44	58	14	58	66	8
		NCE	44.7	46.8	2.1	46.8	54.2	7.4	54.2	58.7	4.5
4	13	SS	595	641	46**	564	618	54**	514	584	70**
		%ile	20	24	4	46	44	-2	28	34	6
		NCE	32.2	35.1	2.8	47.9	46.8	-1.1	37.7	41.3	3.6
5	34	SS	653	695	32**	612	665	53**	578	654	76**
		%ile	34	38	4	42	44	2	30	46	16
		NCE	41.3	43.6	2.3	45.8	46.8	1.0	39.0	47.9	8.9
6	29	SS	688	715	27**	650	713	63**	626	697	71**
		%ile	34	40	6	38	54	16	32	52	20
		NCE	41.3	44.7	3.4	43.6	52.1	8.5	40.1	51.1	11.0
7	30	SS	699	703	4	671	688	17	647	711	64**
		%ile	34	24	-10	42	32	-10	32	36	4
		NCE	41.3	35.1	-6.2	45.8	40.1	-5.7	40.1	42.5	2.4
8	24	SS	681	719	38**	681	729	48**	683	716	33**
		%ile	16	22	6	30	36	6	22	30	8
		NCE	29.1	33.7	4.6	39.0	42.5	3.5	33.7	39.0	5.3

[1]Note: SS=Scaled Score; %ile=Percentile Rank; NCE=Normal Curve Equivalent **p <.01

evident that sixth grade Suburban school students exhibited a higher level of performance (739) than fourth grade Suburban school students (679). It is important to note that scaled scores cannot be compared across skill areas. For example at grade 4, one cannot conclude that the spring 1982 Reading performance of students in the Suburban school component (679) is superior to their Mathematics performance (608).

Tables 6 and 7 also contain percentile (%ile) scores. Percentile scores can be explained best using an example. A percentile score of 46 in Reading for grade 3 Suburban participants indicates that on the average, their performance was better than or equal to 46% of the students in the norming population taking that test in the spring at grade 3. Percentiles are not expressed in equal interval units. The difference between scores at the 80th and 90th percentiles is not the same as the difference between scores at the 50th and 60th percentiles. Percentiles can be standardized (i.e., converted to equal interval units) by converting them to normal curve equivalents (NCE). Normal curve equivalents are also reported in Tables 6-7.

An NCE of 50 is indicative of average performance for students at that grade level in the skill areas tested. For example, Suburban Concern pupils at grade 3 exhibited average performance on their pretest at grade 2 in Reading as evidenced by an NCE of 50. To the extent that the NCE departs from 50, students exhibit above or below average performance in the skill area tested.

Title I evaluation guidelines require that growth in the basic skill areas should be determined by examining the pre- and post test change in the mean normal curve equivalent performance of the students

being served. This approach was utilized in assessing the achievement growth of Project Concern participants. In reviewing Tables 6-8, the following points should be kept in mind:

a) A positive NCE gain indicates students have improved their relative standing regarding the national norm group,

b) A zero NCE gain indicates the relative standing of students has not changed regarding the national norm group,

c) A negative NCE gain indicates students have fallen behind in relative standing regarding the national norm group.

Findings Regarding the Cognitive Impact of Project Concern

A basic question which arises in reviewing Tables 6-8 is - what do these results tell us about the basic skill growth of Project Concern participants? Achievement growth can be examined on an absolute and on a relative basis. In assessing absolute growth, one is asking the question - how much basic skill growth have Project Concent students exhibited? A measure of absolute growth is provided by comparing spring 1981 to spring 1982 standard score means for each of the skill areas tested. These results are presented by grade level in Tables 6-7. To determine whether the spring to spring basic skill growth exhibited was statistically significant, correlated t-tests for the differences between means were conducted. In measuring the absolute achievement growth of Project Concern participants based on the results presented in Tables 6-7, the following conclusions can be drawn:

With the exception of grade 7, both Suburban and Inner-City Project Concern participants exhibited statistically significant (.01 level) basic skill growth in Reading, Language and Mathematics.

At grade 7, both Suburban and Inner-City Project Concern participants exhibited statistically significant (.01 level) basic skill growth in Mathematics.

At grade 7, both Suburban and Inner-City Project Concern participants did not exhibit statistically significant basic skill growth in Reading.

While grade 7 Suburban Concern participants exhibited statistically significant (.01 level) basic skill growth in Language, Inner-City program grade 7 students did not.

In assessing relative growth, one is asking the question- as a result of the achievement progress exhibited in the areas tested, has the relative standing of the students changed regarding the national norm group? Percentile ranks and normal curve equivalents provide a measure of the relative standing of a group in relation to the national norm. As noted earlier, normal curve equivalents are preferable to percentiles because NCEs are expressed in equal interval units. The relative basic skill growth of Project Concern participants was determined by comparing the spring 1981 and spring 1982 mean NCE performance for each of the skill areas tested. These results are summarized in Table 8. In assessing the relative achievement growth of Project Concern participants based on the results presented in Table 8, the following conclusions can be drawn:

. Inner-City Project Concern participants tended to exhibit relative basic skill growth in those areas at each grade level where statistically significant absolute growth was evident. This indicates that the statistically significant basic skill progress exhibited by these students was generally reflected

Table 8

Summary of Mean Normal Curve Equivalent Achievement Growth by
Grade Level, Skill Area, and Program Component for Project Concern Participants

Grade	No. of Students		Reading		Language		Mathematics	
	Suburban	Inner-City	Suburban	Inner-City	Suburban	Inner-City	Suburban	Inner-City
3	48	21	-2.1	+2.1	0	+7.4	+1.1	+4.5
4	68	13	-1.0	+2.8	-1.1	-1.1	-1.1	+3.6
5	69	34	+1.1	+2.3	-3.2	+1.0	+3.2	+8.9
6	79	29	+5.3	+3.4	+2.1	+8.5	+2.1	+11.0
7	84	30	-4.3	-6.2	-3.2	-5.7	-2.1	+2.4
8	101	24	+2.1	+4.6	-2.1	+3.5	+4.2	+5.3
9	79		2.2		2.1		-1.1	

in an improvement in their standing relative to the national norm group.

For Suburban Project Concern participants, the relationship between absolute and relative basic skill growth tended to be mixed. Often statistically significant basic skill growth was not reflected in an improvement in the students' standing relative to the national norm group.

To obtain further insights regarding the relative basic skill achievement growth of Project Concern participants, NCE Reading and Mathematics results were analyzed by grouping students on the basis of their spring 1981 percentile rank. Four categories were formed as follows:

23rd percentile and below

24th - 36th percentile

37th - 50th percentile

51st percentile and above

Mean NCE reading and mathematics growth is reported for each of these categories by grade level in Tables 9-10. Such data are informative since they provide a measure of relative growth for students of different proficiency levels as determined by their pretest performance. From Tables 9-10 the following trends are evident:

For both Suburban and Inner-City Project Concern participants, students at or below the 50th percentile at most grade levels tended to exhibit positive NCE growth in Mathematics. Also, the level of NCE growth exhibited tended to be greater for students in the lower percentile categories.

For both Suburban and Inner-City Project Concern participants, students at or below the 23rd percentile at most grade levels tended to exhibit the most NCE gain in Reading. Trends in NCE Reading growth among the other percentile categories were mixed.

Table 9

Summary by Grade Level and Percentile Category of
Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test Spring 1981 (Pre-) and
Spring 1982 (Post) NCE Results for Project Concern Students

Suburban Component

Grade	%ile Category	Reading N	Reading Pre-	Reading Post	Reading Growth	Mathematics N	Mathematics Pre-	Mathematics Post	Mathematics Growth
	23 and below	6	20.4	35.1	14.7	6	23.0	37.7	14.7
	24-36	7	41.3	37.7	-3.6	9	39.0	44.7	5.7
3	37-50	9	46.8	45.8	-1.0	13	46.8	48.9	2.1
	51 and above	26	61.0	54.2	-6.8	20	64.9	57.5	-7.4
	Total	48	50.0	47.9	-2.1	48	50.0	51.1	1.1
	23 and below	11	27.2	30.7	3.5	14	23.0	32.3	9.3
	24-36	13	40.1	39.0	-1.1	15	40.1	40.1	-
4	37-50	23	46.8	43.6	-3.2	7	46.8	41.3	-5.5
	51 and above	20	64.9	62.3	-2.6	33	63.5	58.7	-4.8
	Total	67	46.8	45.8	-1.0	69	47.9	46.8	-1.1
	23 and below	7	32.3	34.4	2.1	8	30.7	37.7	7.0
	24-36	22	37.7	41.3	3.6	20	39.0	45.8	6.8
5	37-50	21	46.8	47.9	1.1	13	46.8	47.9	1.1
	51 and above	20	62.3	61.0	-1.3	27	58.7	57.5	-1.2
	Total	70	46.8	47.9	1.1	68	46.8	50.0	3.2
	23 and below	16	27.2	37.7	10.5	10	27.2	39.0	11.8
	24-36	21	39.0	44.7	5.7	12	39.0	44.7	5.7
6	37-50	20	46.8	48.9	2.1	20	46.8	47.9	1.1
	51 and above	22	63.5	66.3	2.8	37	61.0	62.3	1.3
	Total	79	45.8	51.1	5.3	79	50.0	52.1	2.1
	23 and below	11	30.7	27.2	-3.5	9	27.2	36.5	9.3
	24-36	22	40.1	34.4	-5.7	16	39.0	32.3	-6.7
7	37-50	22	46.8	42.5	-4.3	26	46.8	41.3	-5.5
	51 and above	29	62.3	55.3	-7.0	34	59.9	56.4	-3.5
	Total	84	47.9	43.6	-4.3	85	47.9	45.8	-2.1
	23 and below	22	23.0	29.1	6.1	26	20.4	35.1	14.7
	24-36	26	37.0	42.5	3.5	16	40.1	42.5	2.4
8	37-50	17	47.9	47.8	-	24	46.8	48.9	2.1
	51 and above	36	61.0	59.9	-1.1	35	63.5	62.3	-1.2
	Total	101	45.8	47.9	2.1	101	44.7	48.9	4.2
	23 and below	13	27.2	33.7	6.5	14	24.2	30.7	6.5
	24-36	19	39.0	42.5	3.5	12	37.7	40.1	2.4
9	37-50	16	47.9	48.9	1.0	18	46.8	47.9	1.1
	51 and above	31	62.3	63.5	1.2	35	62.3	58.7	-3.6
	Total	79	48.9	51.1	2.2	79	48.9	47.9	-1.0

Table 10

Summary by Grade Level and Percentile Category of
Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test Spring 1981 (Pre-) and
Spring 1982 (Post) NCE Results for Project Concern Students

Inner-City Component

Grade	%ile Category	Reading N	Reading Pre-	Reading Post	Reading Growth	Mathematics N	Mathematics Pre-	Mathematics Post	Mathematics Growth
	23 and below	6	27.2	35.1	7.9	3	29.1	41.3	12.2
	24-36	3	37.7	35.1	-2.6	2	36.5	59.9	23.4
3	37-50	5	46.8	53.2	6.4	6	47.9	43.6	-4.3
	51 and above	7	61.0	57.5	-3.5	10	70.9	72.8	1.9
	Total	21	44.7	46.8	2.1	21	54.2	58.7	4.5
	23 and below	6	17.3	25.3	8.0	4	20.4	23.0	2.6
	24-36	5	39.0	35.1	-3.9	5	37.7	47.9	10.2
4	37-50	1	45.8	43.6	-2.2	2	45.8	50.0	4.2
	51 and above	1	66.3	82.7	16.4	2	64.9	62.3	-2.6
	Total	13	32.3	35.1	2.8	13	37.7	41.3	3.6
	23 and below	13	24.2	23.0	-1.2	13	24.2	33.7	9.5
	24-36	8	39.0	47.9	8.9	7	39.0	43.6	4.6
5	37-50	6	46.8	48.9	2.1	4	46.8	55.3	8.5
	51 and above	7	70.9	70.9	-	10	61.0	63.5	2.5
	Total	34	41.3	43.6	2.3	34	29.0	47.9	8.9
	23 and below	9	30.7	39.0	8.3	8	23.0	37.7	14.7
	24-36	7	37.7	43.6	5.9	8	37.7	50.0	12.3
6	37-50	9	45.8	43.6	-2.2	4	46.8	51.1	4.3
	51 and above	4	62.3	62.3	-	9	58.7	62.3	3.6
	Total	29	41.3	44.7	3.4	29	40.1	51.1	11.0
	23 and below	7	29.1	24.2	4.9	11	25.3	29.1	3.8
	24-36	11	39.0	34.4	-4.6	5	37.7	41.3	3.6
7	37-50	8	46.8	42.5	-4.3	7	47.9	52.1	4.2
	51 and above	4	54.2	44.7	-9.5	7	58.7	56.4	-2.3
	Total	30	41.3	35.1	-6.2	30	40.1	42.5	2.4
	23 and below	12	17.3	25.3	8.0	14	23.0	30.7	7.7
	24-36	10	39.0	39.0	-	5	39.0	39.0	-
8	37-50	1	46.8	40.1	-6.7	2	50.0	45.8	-4.2
	51 and above	1	82.7	69.3	-13.4	3	67.7	70.9	3.2
	Total	24	29.1	33.7	4.6	24	33.7	39.0	5.3

A higher concentration of negative Reading and Mathematics NCE growth was exhibited among students in the Suburban rather than the Inner-City components of Project Concern, especially for students in the 51st percentile and above category.

In summary, both Suburban and Inner-City Project Concern participants tended to exhibit statistically significant basic skill growth in the areas of Reading, Language, and Mathematics. While such significant absolute growth was reflected in positive relative growth for Inner-City participants, this was not the case for Suburban participants, especially for those Suburban students at the 51st percentile and above.

These findings lead to the question - why didn't Suburban participants make sufficient skill progress to exhibit mean substantial relative growth? One viable explanation for this lack of mean substantial relative growth may be the manner in which the achievement testing was conducted in the suburbs. While Inner-City participants were administered the Metropolitan Achievement Tests by their classroom teachers as part of the Hartford Public Schools testing program, Suburban participants were taken out of their classroom (i.e. away from their normal routine of school activities) to be tested. As noted earlier, these testing arrangements may have deteriorated further since suburban personnel were being required to test Concern students as part of the evaluation of a program that had been at that time terminated by the Hartford Board of Education. This combination of reactive testing arrangements and low moral due to the termination of Project Concern could have affected student test performance sufficiently to result in lower post test scores and thus, the lack of more substantive relative basic skill achievement growth on the part of Suburban Project

Concern participants. In subsequent years, it is important to systematically monitor the manner and atmosphere in which the testing of Suburban Concern participants is conducted.

Monitoring Affective Impact

Since several research studies have shown that affective variables relate to school achievement (see Bloom, Human Characteristics and School Learning and Purkey, Self-Concept and School Achievement), the Student Survey was developed during the 1977-1978 evaluation of the Project Concern to monitor the affective impact of the program. The Student Survey contains a series of items which assess student self-concept and attitude toward school. It should be noted that the self-concept and attitude variables are complex constructs. The 10 items contained in the Student Survey were selected from the Instructional Objectives Exchange nationally normed item pool for assessing the areas of self-concept and attitude toward school. The complete sets of self-concept and attitude toward school items could not be employed as separate measures due to test length considerations. Since the items selected do represent the self-concept and school attitude domains, they can be employed validly to assess student status. Given the close relationship between how students feel about themselves (self-concept) and their attitudes toward various school situations, the set of 10 items was selected to generally reflect both constructs.

The Student Survey was administered during the spring of 1982 to participants in the Suburban and Inner-City components of Project Concern at grades 2-10 at the same time as these students were admini-

stered the Metropolitan Achievement Tests. Table 11 contains the combined totals, percents and frequencies for all Project Concern students selecting the "True" responses on the Student Survey. Perusal of the combined totals responses in Table 11 indicates that, overall, the students in Project Concern have a positive self-concept and attitude twoard school. This statement can be supported further by an analysis of the items in the survey. Tables 12-13 contain an item by grade level summary of responses to the Student Survey for Suburban and Inner-City Concern participants. The ten items used in the survey reflected three general areas: feelings about school and school work, attitudes toward classroom participation, and feelings about teachers.

School and School Work. The majority of students feel quite comfortable with their school experience and their school work. For the combined group of respondents, 41% indicated that they often get discouraged in school (item 5) and 52% felt that they were not doing as well in school as they would like to do (item 8). Further, 86% felt that they could get good grades if they wanted to (item 3), 66% felt their school work was fairly easy (item 1), and 82% were proud of their school work (item 7). In addition, only 28% of the Suburban Project Concern students felt that they were slow in finishing their school work (item 6). This is a positive finding in that Project Concern students tend to compare themselves positively to their classroom counterparts in this area of work completion.

Class Participation. The area of class participation is important as the Project Concern students should feel comfortable in their classroom setting. It appears that this is the case since 67% of the

Table 11

Percent and Frequency of "True" Responses
on the Student Survey for Students Participating in
All Components of the Project Concern Program

N = (862)

	Item Stem	Combined Totals
1.	School work is farily easy for me.	66% (561)
2.	My teachers usually like me.	87% (741)
3.	I can get good grades if I want to.	86% (736)
4.	I often volunteer to do things in class.	67% (573)
5.	I often get discouraged in school.	41% (353)
6.	I am slow in finishing my school work.	29% (249)
7.	I am proud of my work.	82% (701)
8.	I am not doing as well in school as I would like to.	52% (445)
9.	I find it hard to talk in front of class.	50% (425)
10.	I don't like to be called on in class.	26% (222)

Table 12

Percent and Frequency of "True" Responses on the Student Survey
By Grade Level for Students Participating in the Suburban Schools Component of
The Project Concern Program

Item Stem	Grade Level 2 (N=50)	3 (N=51)	4 (N=74)	5 (N=78)	6 (N=81)	7 (N=99)	8 (N=107)	9 (N=88)	10 (N=58)	Total (N=686)
*1. School work is fairly easy for me.	44% (22)	51% (26)	60% (44)	67% (50)	75% (60)	68% (67)	73% (77)	83% (72)	79% (46)	68% (464)
2. My teachers usually like me.	80% (40)	86% (44)	82% (61)	88% (67)	86% (70)	85% (83)	90% (95)	91% (80)	91% (53)	87% (593)
*3. I can get good grades if I want to.	59% (29)	67% (34)	85% (63)	83% (64)	88% (71)	88% (87)	93% (99)	96% (84)	97% (56)	86% (587)
*4. I often volunteer to do thins in class.	76% (37)	77% (39)	80% (59)	71% (55)	61% (49)	58% (57)	62% (66)	53% (47)	43% (25)	63% (434)
5. I often get discouraged in school.	52% (26)	41% (21)	44% (32)	47% (36)	43% (34)	42% (41)	32% (34)	33% (29)	35% (20)	40% (273)
6. I am slow in finishing my school work.	38% (18)	35% (18)	32% (24)	23% (17)	30% (24)	32% (31)	25% (27)	19% (17)	26% (15)	28% (191)
*7. I am proud of my school work.	88% (43)	92% (47)	88% (64)	89% (69)	86% (69)	71% (70)	77% (82)	67% (59)	79% (46)	81% (549)
8. I am not doing as well in school as I would like to do.	35% (17)	42% (21)	43% (32)	47% (36)	54% (44)	58% (57)	63% (67)	59% (52)	63% (35)	53% (361)
9. I find it hard to talk in front of the class.	58% (28)	49% (25)	64% (47)	39% (30)	51% (41)	51% (50)	43% (46)	41% (36)	54% (31)	49% (334)
10. I don't like to be called on in class.	35% (17)	26% (13)	22% (16)	23% (18)	26% (21)	33% (32)	17% (18)	32% (28)	28% (16)	26% (179)

Table 13

Percent and Frequency of "True" Responses on the Student Survey
By Grade Level for Students Participating in the Inner-City Schools Component
of the Project Concern Program

Item Stem	Grade Level 2 (N=21)	3 (N=22)	4 (N=13)	5 (N=32)	6 (N=31)	7 (N-31)	8 (N=26)	Total (N=176)
1. School work is fairly easy for me.	67% (14)	38% (8)	39% (5)	59% (19)	68% (21)	48% (15)	58% (15)	55% (97)
2. My teachers usually like me.	95% (20)	91% (20)	83% (10)	88% (28)	80% (24)	71% (22)	92% (24)	85% (148)
3. I can get good grades if I want to.	62% (13)	73% (16)	77% (10)	88% (28)	97% (30)	94% (29)	89% (23)	85% (149)
*4. I often volunteer to do things in class.	81% (17)	91% (20)	100% (13)	75% (24)	90% (28)	70% (21)	62% (16)	79% (139)
5. I often get discouraged in school.	29% (6)	68% (15)	69% (9)	38% (12)	47% (14)	45% (14)	39% (10)	46% (80)
6. I am slow in finishing my school work.	38% (8)	46% (10)	62% (8)	28% (9)	19% (6)	35% (10)	27% (7)	33% (58)
*7. I am proud of my school work.	95% (20)	96% (21)	92% (12)	91% (29)	97% (30)	67% (20)	77% (20)	87% (152)
*8. I am not doing as well in school as I would like to.	24% (5)	46% (10)	39% (5)	38% (12)	43% (13)	81% (25)	54% (14)	48% (84)
*9. I find it hard to talk in front of the class.	29% (6)	81% (17)	69% (9)	55% (17)	39% (12)	52% (16)	54% (14)	52% (91)
*10. I don't like to be called on in class.	5% (1)	18% (4)	55% (6)	28% (9)	16% (5)	32% (10)	31% (8)	25% (43)

combined group indicated they often volunteer to do things in class (item 4). Further, 50% felt that they found it hard to talk in front of the class (item 9) and only 26% indicated that they didn't like to be called on in class (item 10).

Teachers. The student perception that their teachers like them is essential for the development of healthy self-images and school attitudes. For the combined group of Project Concern students, 87% indicated that their teachers usually liked them (item 2).

With respect to differences in self-concept and school attitudes across grade levels, some significant differences for Suburban participants were evident as follows:

> As grade level increased, more students felt school work was fairly easy for them (item 1).
>
> As grade level increased, more students felt they could get good grades if they wanted to (item 3).
>
> As grade level increased, fewer students indicated they often volunteered to do things in class (item 4).
>
> As grade level increased, fewer students were proud of their school work (item 7).

For Inner-City participants, the following significant differences in self-concept and school attitudes were evident across grade levels:

> As grade level increased, fewer students indicated they often volunteered to do things in class (item 4).
>
> As grade level increased, fewer students were proud of their school work (item 7).
>
> As grade level increased, more students felt they were not doing as well in school as they would like to (item 8).

As grade level increased, fewer students found it hard to talk in front of the class (item 9).

As grade level increased, more students didn't like to be called on in class (item 10).

In summary, it can be concluded that the self-concept and school attitudes of the Suburban and Inner-City Project Concern students in the areas of school and school work, classroom participation, and teachers are quite positive. The affective orientation of students participating in the 1981-1982 Project Concern Program is consistent with the results of past evaluations of Project Concern when the Student Survey was used.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

The evaluation of the 1981-1982 Project Concern program focused on the following two areas:

1. An evaluation of the sustained occupational outcomes of Project Concern graduates, dropouts and Hartford non-participants.

2. An examination of the cognitive and affective impact of Project Concern.

The purpose of this summary is to collate for the reader some of the major findings of this evaluation. It is important to note that perceptions of the Project Concern program should not be formed on the basis of this summary alone. All findings must be interpreted in light of the evaluation design utilized, a more complete discussion of the results presented, and the limitations placed on the findings obtained.

Sustained Occupational Outcomes for 1977-1978 Project Concern Graduates, Dropouts and Hartford Non-Participants

This component of the evaluation consisted of examining the sustained occupational outcomes for three groups of graduates who were studied previously during the 1979-1980 evaluation. This follow-up study of the 1977-1979 Project Concern graduates, dropouts and Hartford non-participants examined the areas of career aspiration, consistency of career planning and patterns, educational training, work history and the transition from school to work.

Participants included the respondents to the original 1979-1980 survey. Due to the low survey return rates, expecially the non-partic-

ipants, and the lack of quality/comprehensive information included in some returned surveys, the validity of the findings may be limited or biased. Readers are therefore cautioned to consider the findings as tentative and not to make any firm conclusions based solely upon these data. Based upon the results of the 1982 survey, and in some cases the comparisons with the 1980 survey, the following conclusions are presented:

Career aspirations of the graduates, dropouts and non-participants were found to be stable from 1980 to 1982.

Consistent with the 1980 survey, there were no significant differences in the five-year projected career aspirations among the graduates, dropouts and non-participants.

The extent of consistency in career planning and patterns was found to be stable for graduates, dropouts and non-participants from 1980 to 1982.

There were no significant differences among the graduates, dropouts and non-participants with respect to the consistency in career planning and progression. While the 1980 survey found graduates and dropouts to have more consistent career patterns than non-participants, the limitations associated with the low return rate for non-participants made the comparisons among the 1982 respondents difficult.

Consistent with the 1980 survey, there was a trend (not significant) for more graduates (64%) to be taking training for or employed in the career they wanted to follow at the time they left high school than for non-participants (25%).

A significantly higher percentage (86%) of graduates have attended schools or colleges than did non-particpants (50%). The 1980 survey found graduates (72%) to have a significantly higher percentage than dropouts (39%) but not significantly higher than non-participants (53%).

A trend (not significant) was found in the 1982 survey data for program graduates to have held fewer jobs, more of which are full-time jobs.

A trend (not significant) was found for less graduates to like their present job "very much" than do dropouts (89%) or non-participants (74%). It was hypothesized that this finding, along with the increased race for graduates attending school or college, could suggest the graduates perception of the current job as a "means to an end" and signify the potential for job mobility. On the 1980 survey the graduates and dropouts tended to like their present job more than did non-participants.

A significantly higher percentage of graduates (60%) felt that their high school education helped them get the job they wanted than did non-participants (25%). The 1980 survey found a non-significant difference where 49% of the graduates and 62% of the non-participants felt this was the case.

The 1980 survey data clearly provided strong support for the contention that Project Concern had a positive effect on the career development of participants. The 1982 survey results were plagued by low return rates and in some cases a lack of comprehensive information provided by respondents. This situation clearly limited the validity of comparisons of program graduates especially with the non-participants. While these particular comparisons were at times limited, positive support for the program was found in several areas examined in the 1982 survey.

An Examination of the Cognitive and Affective Impact of Project Concern

The impact of Project Concern on the cognitive achievement of program participants was assessed by comparing the Metropolitan Achievement Test results from Spring 1982 to those obtained during Spring 1982. It is important to note that some difficulty was encountered in testing Suburban Project Concern students. Personnel in participating suburban school settings were less than positively motivated to conduct the

required testing activities given that the Hartford Board of Education had already announced that the Suburban Project Concern Program would not be continued during the next school year.

Achievement growth on an absolute basis addressed the question - how much basic skill growth have Project Concern students exhibited? The following conclusions were forwarded:

> With the exception of grade 7, both Suburban and Inner-City Project Concern participants exhibited statistically significant (.01 level) basic skill growth in Reading, Language and Mathematics.
>
> At grade 7, both Suburban and Inner-City Project Concern participants exhibited statistically significant (.01 level) basic skill growth in Mathematics.
>
> At grade 7, both Suburban and Inner-City Project Concern participants did not exhibit statistically significant basic skill growth in Reading.
>
> While grade 7 Suburban Concern participants exhibited statistically significant (.01 level) basic skill growth in Language, Inner-City program grade 7 students did not.

In assessing relative growth, one is asking the question - as a result of the achievement progress exhibited in the areas tested, has the relative standing of the students changed regarding the national norm group? The following conclusions were forwarded:

> Inner-City Project Concern participants tended to exhibit relative basic skill growth in those areas at each grade level where statistically significant absolute growth was evident. This indicates that the statistically significant basic skill progress exhibited by these students was generally reflected in an improvement in their standing relative to the national norm group.

> For Suburban Project Concern participants, the relationship between absolute and relative basic skill growth tended to be mixed. Often statistically significant basic skill growth was not reflected in an improvement in the students' standing relative to the national norm group.

Further insights into the relative basic skill growth of participants was obtained by grouping students on the basis of their Spring 1981 percentile ranks. The following trends were found:

> For both Suburban and Inner-City Project Concern participants, students at or below the 50th percentile at most grade levels tended to exhibit positive NCE growth in Mathematics. Also, the level of NCE growth exhibited tended to be greater for students in the lower percentile categories.

> For both Suburban and Inner-City Project Concern participants, students at or below the 23rd percentile at most grade levels tended to exhibit the most NCE gain in Reading. Trends in NCE reading growth among the other percentile categories were mixed.

> A higher concentration of negative Reading and Mathematics NCE growth was exhibited among students in the Suburban rather than the Inner-City components of Project Concern, especially for students in the 51st percentile and above category.

In summary, both Suburban and Inner-City Project Concern participants tended to exhibit statistically significant basic skill growth in the areas of Reading, Language, and Mathematics. While such significant absolute growth was reflected in positive relative growth for Inner-City participants, this was not the case for Suburban participants, especially for those Suburban students at the 51st percentile and above.

To examine the affective area, the Student Survey was administered during the spring of 1982 to participants in the Suburban and Inner-City components of Project Concern at grades 2-10.

With respect to differences in self-concept and school attitudes across grade levels, some significant differences for Suburban participants were evident as follows:

> As grade level increased, more students felt school work was fairly easy for them (item 1).
>
> As grade level increased, more students felt they could get good grades if they wanted to (item 3).
>
> As grade level increased, fewer students indicated they often volunteered to do things in class (item 4).
>
> As grade level increased, fewer students were proud of their school work (item 7).

For Inner-City participants, the following significant differences in self-concept and school attitudes were evident across grade levels:

> As grade level increased, fewer students indicated they often volunteered to do things in class (item 4).
>
> As grade level increased, fewer students were proud of their school work (item 7).
>
> As grade level increased, more students felt they were not doing as well in school as they would like to (item 8).
>
> As grade level increased, fewer students found it hard to talk in front of the class (item 9).
>
> As grade level increased, more students didn't like to be called on in class (item 10).

In summary, it can be concluded that the self-concept and school attitudes of the Suburban and Inner-City Project Concern students in the areas of school and school work, classroom participation, and teachers are quite positive. The affective orientation of students participating in the 1981-1982 Project Concern Program is consistent with the results of past evaluations of Project Concern when the Student Survey was used.

APPENDIX A

FOLLOW-UP OF GRADUATES

Student Name_____ Address_____

Phone (Student or Parent)_____

School Attended_____ Year Graduated_____

Marital Status_____ Number of Children_____

CAREER INFORMATION

1. Are you now taking training for, or employed in the career you wanted to follow at the time you left high school? (Check one) Yes_____ No_____

2. Since leaving high school, have you held any job(s)? (Check one) Yes_____ No_____
If yes, please provide the information below for the job(s) you have held since leaving high school.

Type of Job*	Full Time OR Part Time (Check one)		Did you like this job? (Check one)	
			YES	NO
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

*This includes Military Service

3. How do you like your present job? (If unemployed, answer with respect to your last job.) (Circle one)

a. Like it very much. b. Like it fairly well. c. Do not like it. d. Never had a full-time job.

4. What type of job or career would you like to have five years from now?_____

_____

5. What effect did your high school education have on the jobs you have held since graduating from high school? (Circle one)

a. No effect at all. b. Helped me to get the job I wanted. c. Have never had a full-time job.

6. How hard was it for you to make the change from being a student to a full-time worker? (Circle one)

[illegible] b. Easy c. Not very easy. d. Have not had a full-time job.

7. What has been the main difficulty you have experienced in your present job? (If unemployed, answer with respect to your last job.) (Circle one)

a. No particular difficulty

b. Conflicts with supervisors.

c. My schooling did not prepare me well enough to do the job.

d. Have never had a full-time job.

e. Other (Please explain)_____

8. In comparison to other people your age, how much do you feel you know about lots of different jobs? (Circle one)

a. I know more. b. I know about the same. c. I know less.

9. Comparing yourself to other former Hartford students who graduated about the same time you did, how do you feel you have done with respect to your working life? (Circle one)

a. I have generally done better. b. I have done about the same. c. I have not done as well.

POST HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION

10. Have you attended any schools or colleges since graduating from high school? YES____ NO____

If YES, please provide the following information regarding the schools or colleges you attended.

Name of School or College	No. of Years Attended	Major Areas You Studied	Full Time (check one)	OR Part Time	Did You Graduate? YES (check one)	NO	If You Did Not Graduate, When Do You Expect to Graduate? Month	Year
_____	_____	_____	____	____	____	____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	____	____	____	____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	____	____	____	____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	____	____	____	____	_____	_____

Date:_____

APPENDIX B

Appendix B

Examples of Various Occupations from the North-Hatte Occupational Prestige Scale and Their Relative Ranking from 1 to 10.

---

1. Physician (Medical Doctor)
   Scientist
   College Professor

2. Architect
   Dentist
   Minister

3. Lawyer
   Chemical Engineer
   Airline Pilot

4. Accountant
   Public School Teacher
   Biologist

5. Registered Nurse
   Fashion Designer
   Electrician

6. Insurance Agent
   Bookkeeper
   Undertaker

7. Auto Mechanic
   Policeman
   Clerk Typist

8. Clerk in a Store
   Truck Driver
   Factory Machine Operator

9. Filling Station Attendent
   Coal Miner
   Restaurant Waiter

10. Shoe Shiner
    Janitor
    Trash Collector

APPENDIX C

Appendix C

Examples of the Three Types of Career Patterns

Type	High School Career Choice	Career Choice Five Years From Now	Work History	Post-High School Education or Vocational Training
Consistent				
Example 1	Accountant	Accountant	2 Unrelated Jobs	Attending College in Accounting
2	Culinary Arts	Management in Culinary Arts	1 Related Job	Attending Culinary School
Inconsistent				
Example 1	No Choice	No Choice	2 Unrelated Jobs	None
2	Fashion Design	Fashion Design	2 Unrelated Jobs	Attending College in Early Childhood Education
Mixed				
Example 1	Military	Law Inforcement Officer	No Jobs	Attending College in Business Administration
2	Secretary	Computer Programmer	1 related job to high school choice	None